

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS.

Claims 1-6 and 8-17 are pending. Claims 7 and 18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 8 and 13 are independent. Claims 1, 8, and 13 are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1, 8, and 13 have been amended thereby obviate the objection. Claims 1-6 and 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Claims 1, 8 and 13 have been amended, thereby obviating the antecedent basis issue.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 13, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,157,720 to Yoshiura, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Yoshiura").

Claims 2 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshiura in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,241,599 to Bellovin, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Bellovin”).

Claims 5 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshiura in view of U.S. Patent 6,202,152 to Yuenyongsgool, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yuenyongsgool”).

Claims 8, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiura in view of U.S. Patent 5,594,793 to Bahout (hereinafter, merely “Bahout”).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiura in view of Bahout and further in view of Bellovin.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiura in view of Bahout and further in view of Yuenyongsgool.

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“An audio/video data processing apparatus comprising:...

processing means for compressing audio/video data in units of a compression block having a first data length;

encrypting means for encrypting the compressed data in units of an encryption block having a second data length,

wherein the first data length is a data length of an integer multiple greater than one of the second data length;

storage means for storing the encrypted data; and

control means for writing the encrypted data in said storage means so that data positioned in the same encryption block is also positioned in the same compression block, said control means

reading the data from said storage means in units of the compression block.” (Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Yoshiura relates to an algorithm which encrypts a compressed data block to form an encrypted block. Specifically, Yoshiura states, “one block of the compressed data is applied to the pre-encryption portion 109 for encrypting the block” (Yoshiura, column 4, line 48-49). Yoshiura does not teach or suggest use of a compression block having a length equal to an integer multiple greater than 1 of the encryption block, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants submit that since the reference does not disclose or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1 that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 8 and 13 are also believed to be patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800